

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
DEPARTMENT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND ENERGY

VERIZON-MASSACHUSETTS

)
)
)
D.T.E. 98-57-PHASE III

**RESPONSES OF COVAD COMMUNICATIONS
TO THE SECOND SET OF INFORMATION
REQUESTS OF THE DEPARTMENT**

Request 1:

Referring to the Testimony of Larry D. Gindlesberger and Michael Clancy on behalf of Covad at 11-12 (September 10, 2001), please explain in detail what specific issues you would like a collaborative to resolve and why a collaborative would be an appropriate method of addressing each of those issues.

Answer:

Covad has attached to its testimony a proposed implementation schedule that could be used as a guide to implement a DSL over fiber solution in Massachusetts. Covad believes that a regional collaborative process involving other commissions would be the most effective vehicle for implementing a remote terminal solution throughout Verizon's region.

The collaborative meetings should address the following issues related to offering DSL over fiber, among others:

1. Technical issues such as the installation and preparation of remote terminal sites;
2. Information regarding the geographic location of remote terminals, including boundary information;
3. Central Office connections, including both technical information and ordering processes;
4. Software enhancements;
5. Order processing issues; and
6. OSS interfaces and order processing, including both the technical operational issues.

The collaborative should be structured with strict oversight by the Department, hosted by someone with authority such as a commissioner or hearing examiner.

The host should follow an agenda and should publish minutes for each meeting. Minutes should include an issue log that is addressed at each meeting. Parties should have the proper subject matter experts in attendance.

Dated: October 4, 2001

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
DEPARTMENT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND ENERGY

VERIZON-MASSACHUSETTS

)
)
)
D.T.E. 98-57-PHASE III

**RESPONSES OF COVAD COMMUNICATIONS
TO THE SECOND SET OF INFORMATION
REQUESTS OF THE DEPARTMENT**

Request 2:

Please explain fully how a Massachusetts collaborative would differ in scope from the New York and Texas collaboratives.

Answer:

The New York collaborative has not addressed DSL over fiber issues on any sort of routine basis.

The Texas Collaborative began after SBC had developed most its network to support DSL over fiber. Thus, SBC's business decisions dictated the type of access that CLECs were given. The Collaborative addressed CLEC issues, after the fact.

In the case of Massachusetts, the DTE has an opportunity to develop a DSL over fiber product with the customer's best interests in mind and address all parties' concerns during the construction stage.

Dated: October 4, 2001

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
DEPARTMENT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND ENERGY

VERIZON-MASSACHUSETTS

)
)
)
D.T.E. 98-57-PHASE III

**RESPONSES OF COVAD COMMUNICATIONS
TO THE SECOND SET OF INFORMATION
REQUESTS OF THE DEPARTMENT**

Request 3:

Why would a Massachusetts collaborative provide different relief for Covad than from the New York DSL collaborative?

Answer:

The New York Collaborative addressed discrete issues related to DSL over fiber. It was not designed to *implement* DSL over fiber. The Massachusetts collaborative would be a joint project between Verizon and CLECs that would enable consumers to obtain a broad range of DSL broadband products and services over fiber.

Dated: October 4, 2001

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
DEPARTMENT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND ENERGY

VERIZON-MASSACHUSETTS

)
)
)
D.T.E. 98-57-PHASE III

**RESPONSES OF COVAD COMMUNICATIONS
TO THE SECOND SET OF INFORMATION
REQUESTS OF THE DEPARTMENT**

Request 4:

Please explain fully how a Massachusetts collaborative would differ from the meetings conducted by the Maryland commission.

Answer:

The Maryland Collaborative was ineffective because Verizon did not engage in good faith negotiations on DSL over fiber issues. Verizon's position in the Collaborative was that it was not legally required to provide "plug and play." Moreover, the Maryland Collaborative was an informal, information-gathering process to staff in making recommendations to the Commission on DSL over fiber issues.

In contrast, an effective collaborative process must have at least the following components: (1) strict oversight by the Department; (2) an implementation schedule that includes specific goals and a timeline for resolution of issues; (3) a dispute resolution process that would move issues forward if there is an impasse and; (4) a final, enforceable Department action.

Dated: October 4, 2001